



"Oh! infirm of purpose! . . . . .  
 " . . . . . I have given suck; and know  
 "How tender 'tis, to love the babe that milks me:  
 "I would, while it was smiling in my face,  
 "Have pluck'd my nipple from his boneless gums,  
 "And dash'd the brains out, had I but so sworn  
 "As you have done to this."

LADY MACBETH.

TO

MR. JONES, OF BRISTOL.

*On the present state of the Paper-Thing, and particularly on the  
 Small-Paper Money Bill, now before the House of Commons.*

Kensington, 22d February, 1826.

SIR,

THERE has been, since Parliament met, such masses of botheration put forth, that the public in general, and that even you, can, being, as you are, at a distance from the scene, have but a confused notion of the real state of the PAPER-THING, and of what is going on, in Parliament, relative to it. It shall be my business, at this time, to endeavour to make these matters as plain as I can;

and, I address myself to you as a mark of that respect which I bear towards you for your great public services, in which respect I only participate with all the well-informed and honest part of the people.

The Paper Thing must have come down, first or last; it contains within itself the seeds of its own destruction; it is vile and abominable in its nature; it is a corrupt and offensive mortal disease in the political body; but, it

R

[ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.]

was hastened to destruction by your laudable exertions of last summer. And now, I think, is the time for giving to the public the history of that memorable and most important transaction. You, with that candour, which always marks the character of really public-spirited men, *wished this to be done at the time*; but, I thought it best not to do it just then. Now, however, it may do good; and, therefore, it shall be done.

#### HISTORY OF MR. JONES'S PETITION.

This petition has been mentioned, in both Houses of Parliament, as one of the causes which led to the discredit of the paper of the Rooks; and, it is, therefore, proper that the real history of it should be known.

Bank of England notes ceased to be a *legal tender* ever since the 1st of May 1823; but, the Rooks have always, in different parts of the country, and under favourable circumstances, *continued to tender them*, when called upon for gold. The people had, for so many years, known them to be a legal tender, that they, in most cases, still thought they were such; and, well they might; for there had been no *public act* giving them information to the contrary. Some individuals knew that they were *not a legal tender*; but, these were, in general, overawed by the power and influence of the Rooks; so that, there was, and there could be, *no circulation of gold*, except in London. The country-people liked the Rooks' notes full as well, or better, than the mother-bank notes. So that a Rook had only to have at hand

a bundle of mother-bank notes, the mere sight of which sent away in silence every applicant for gold! And this was called "*paper on a metallic basis!*" This was called "*paper convertible into gold!*" All the newspapers of London, and almost all in the country, sided with the Rooks; so that the people in general were kept in profound ignorance as to their *right to demand gold*.

Thus it was that the country was crammed with the vile paper-money; but, at last, Mr. JONES, in order to bring this question before the public, in some shape or other, went to a bank in Bristol, took a witness with him, tendered some of its notes for payment, was offered Bank of England notes in payment, refused to take any thing but gold, and was *refused the gold*. As soon as he had done this, he (who was before wholly unknown to me) wrote to me for my advice how to act. I immediately went to Bristol, saw Mr. Jones, saw the notes, found that all was correct. I advised him to petition Parliament, which was then *just about to be prorogued*. The petition was instantly drawn up; and, I shall not soon forget, that Mr. Jones, when he rose up after signing the petition, said, "Let CASTLES, OLIVER and EDWARDS deal with *that*, if they can." I instantly set off back towards London, with the petition, the notes, and with instructions from Mr. Jones to an attorney in London to sue out writs against the bankers. When I got to NEWBURY I was dead tired, I quitted the coach and went to bed, and the next morning, being Sunday, took a post-



chaise, and reached home about ten o'clock.

On the Monday morning, I put the notes and instructions into the hands of the Attorney, and the petition into the hands of Mr. HUME, who presented it to the House of Commons, on Wednesday, the 22d of June. But, having been closely pushed (which he ought not to have been) to say, whether *he knew all the facts stated in the petition to be true*, he said, that he could not *know* that; and he, therefore, *withdrew* the petition, in order to have time for *inquiry into the facts*. I, being that same night, apprized of this, was, the next morning with Mr. HUME, I took the *notes* to him, took him the *instructions* to the Attorney, and offered to bring him proof of the *issuing of the writ* against the bankers. Thus armed, Mr. HUME went to the House on Thursday, the 23d of June, *showed the notes*, and was about to present the petition again; but, the Members for Bristol, HART DAVIES and BRIGHT, having pressed him to put it off *till the next Monday*, in order that they might obtain "*explanations from Bristol*," he consented so to do.

I, who was apprized of this as soon as it had taken place, thought that, if there were wanted "*explanations from Bristol*," nobody was much more likely to give *useful* ones than Mr. JONES, wrote to that gentleman on Friday, the 24th of June, and suggested the utility of HIS BEING HERE on Monday, the 27th of June; and, it will be seen, that it was his promptitude in acting upon this advice that caused the success of this his most meritorious effort in behalf of his abused and cheat-

ed countrymen. The moment he got my letter, off he came, and was in London on Sunday, the 26th of June. On Monday morning, the 27th, he went to Mr. HUME's house: but, before I proceed further, I should state what had, before his departure from Bristol, taken place *there*.

The petition was, as we have seen, first presented on Wednesday, the 22d. It was presented early in the evening, and the Bristol bankers got intelligence of it on Thursday about noon. In the afternoon of *that day*, an Attorney went to Mr. JONES, as a messenger from the bankers, and pulling them out, *tendered him sovereigns for the notes*. He could not receive them, for *the notes were in London*; and, therefore, the Attorney took them back to his employers.

To return, now, to Mr. HUME, Mr. JONES found, that he was *out of town*, and would not come to his own house before he went to the House of Commons. This was sharp work; for, it was absolutely necessary, that Mr. JONES should see Mr. HUME, before this expected "*explanations*" took place, through the channel of the members for Bristol. It was also necessary to be quite prepared for all emergencies in so critical a moment. Another petition might be wanted *on the spot*; a sort of *drum-head* petition.

Therefore, my eldest son went with Mr. JONES into the *Lobby* of the House of Commons, while a friend, in the gallery, reconnoitred from that commanding eminence, and while my youngest son and a companion of about his own age and size, were appointed to act as *scouts*, to bring, from the Lobby,

intelligence TO ME, who, as general in chief, was stationed in a private room, in a coffee-house, in Palace-yard, with pen, ink and paper, ready to act as circumstances might require.

My son, having sent into the House for Mr. HUME, the latter came out, and, knowing my son, told him (before the latter had spoken), that Mr. HART DAVIES had assured him, that *sovereigns had actually been tendered to Mr. Jones, who had refused to receive them!* Having said this, Mr. HUME went into the House, and brought out Mr. HART DAVIES, who repeated the assurance.—Whereupon my son said: “I know nothing of the matter myself, Sir; but, **HERE IS MR. JONES!**”—The devil he was! Now, then, came out the real “*explanation.*” At last, Mr. HUME said, “**WHEN, Sir,** was it that “the sovereigns were tendered to “you?” “On **THURSDAY AFTERNOON, Sir,**” answered Mr. Jones, “after the intelligence “arrived of your having done me “the honour to present my petition.” “Then, Sir,” said Mr. HUME, “I will present your petition immediately; and, if you “please, you may come and see “me do it.” So saying, he went into the House, and took Mr. JONES, and seated him under the gallery, where he heard all that took place on this memorable occasion.

The *immediate*, even the *immediate*, effects of this spirited and prompt conduct on the part of Mr. Jones, were very great, and the more distant effects have been, and will be, prodigious. This petition *enlightened the whole country*; and, in less than a month after it

was presented, I had *proof* that the *farmers were getting gold from the Rooks*; slowly and cautiously; but, that they *were getting it*. My *proof* was confined to *one circle*; but, I well knew, that what was doing there was doing *every where*; and the *consequences* I was as sure of as I was of the coming of Christmas. We have seen *some* of those consequences already; but, it is only a small part that we have yet seen.

Now, Mr. JONES, though, I dare say, you read a great deal about this matter, you can have no idea of the confusion that really does exist. First, let me give you some extracts from newspapers showing the miserable state into which this abominable system has plunged the working people. In your address to the Bishop of Bristol, which I have read with very great pleasure, you point out to him the sin of paper-money; its greatest sin, that of robbing and starving the Poor; that of making those live on grains and almost on dirt, whose forefathers lived on meat, bread and beer. Read the following extracts: they are not of my writing. The facts are not of my invention: the dismal, the disgraceful scenes exist in England, and they are described by those who call themselves loyal by way of excellence. How it will end at last no man can say; but you will have the satisfaction of reflecting, that you have done your best to prevent these calamities. For, you will please to observe, that the whole of this dreadful mischief has been done, *through the means of the Bank of England notes*. In the year 1822, we were come down to low prices;



we ought to have remained at low prices, and some settlement of the affairs of the nation might have quietly taken place. And then this elastic country would have soon recovered itself. But, that pernicious small note Bill which was passed in the year 1822, against which I protested at the time, and for the passing of which Ministers all now assume sack-cloth and ashes; that pernicious Bill re-opened the flood-gates of paper-money; authorized all the Banks to make small notes again; and induced the country rooks to make an illusory tender of Bank of England notes, whenever they met with a person who had sense enough to demand gold. Hence the bales of paper which produced all those gamblings, all those bubbles which are now bursted, and the bursting of which, has produced all this ruin, all this despair and starvation, a small part of which, a mere specimen of which, you will find exhibited in the following extracts:—

*Leeds Intelligencer, 9 Feb.*

We regret to state that the Saddleworth Bank, of Messrs. Harrop, Lees and Co. suspended payment about twelve o'clock on Monday last, and circulated notices to that effect in Saddleworth and also in Oldham, where they had an office. The consternation produced by this event in the latter place is described as extreme, and a run immediately commenced on the other Saddleworth Bank, of Messrs. Buckley, Roberts and Co. which continued during Tuesday. We rejoice to say, however, that every demand was met with promptitude, and in consequence, that the panic has subsided. We understand the firm of Messrs. Harrop and Co. possesses, not only ample funds to answer all engage-

ments, but are absolutely rich in resources, though not immediately available. The amount of their notes in circulation is said to be comparatively small, and that it is probable the chief distress arising from their failure will be amongst the persons to whom they have been in the habit of granting, on security of their factories, &c. an extensive accommodation, which must now be withdrawn. Many spinners and manufacturers, who had been accustomed to pay the wages of their hands in the notes of this bank, will, of course, be at some temporary inconvenience. Our correspondent at Huddersfield, mentions the stoppage as "another hard blow upon the trade of that town." But we are happy to say, he adds, that the two other Huddersfield Banks of Messrs. Rawson and Co. and Messrs. Wilson and Co. go on well, and enjoy the perfect confidence of the public.

Messrs. Rawsons and Co., of Halifax, in consequence, we presume, of the measures announced by Ministers, have determined on immediately withdrawing all their small notes from circulation, and supplying their place with gold and silver. In the meantime, the accommodation to their customers will of necessity be somewhat narrowed, and a little inconvenience perhaps result to the inhabitants generally.

On Saturday, a very strong sensation was excited in Manchester, by the following notice from one of the Banks in that town:—

"Thomas Crewdson and Co. respectfully acquaint their friends, that in consequence of the present unexampled pressure upon the money-market, and other unforeseen circumstances, they have come to the painful conclusion that it is best to wind up the concerns of their bank: in order to which they must ask from their friends the indulgence of a little time. It is, however, a great satisfaction to them to state, that they have not the least doubt of being able to discharge every claim

upon them, and have an ample surplus. A statement of the affairs of the bank is preparing, in order to be laid before the creditors as soon as possible. — Manchester, 4th of 2d Month, 1826."

The house in question had only existed as a banking establishment about twelve months, and it is considered that their suspension of payment has arisen chiefly from their having been too liberal in their discounts, and not possessing sufficient nerve to contend with so harassing a crisis as the present. We believe, however, that amongst the best informed persons, no doubt exists of their ultimate solvency, or of the settlement of their affairs at no very distant period.

Halifax, Wednesday, Feb. 8, 1826. — "All the pensioners in this neighbourhood, were on Saturday, paid their quarterly allowance in notes of Messrs. Harrop and Co.'s Saddleworth Bank, and were put to great inconvenience by endeavouring to make them available. After the stoppage, however, on Monday, on presenting them to the proper officers, gold was given in return. Much inconvenience and dissatisfaction are also prevalent here among the labouring classes from another source; although, perhaps, the commotion which has been so generally felt, has produced comparatively a trifling effect in this town and its immediate vicinity. Several manufacturers, by way of lessening the amount of expense to which they have been subjected, by getting bills discounted in currency, have levied it upon their labourers; so that after a man has been hard toiling all the week for the means of his subsistence, on presenting his demand, a deduction after the rate of 3½d. in the pound from the amount due to him, is made.

*Morning Herald, 20th Feb.*

Manchester, Feb. 10. — There is no other prospect than that a large proportion of the weavers will be out of

work, or at best only partially employed; and that at a rate of wages quite insufficient for their maintenance.

In Blackburn, the distress is to an extent and of a severity much exceeding what has yet been felt here.

In Burnley, Colne, and throughout the districts which are the chief seat of the calico manufacturing branch, the state of things is if possible still worse. We hear from the manufacturers who reside there, that the wan appearance and dispirited condition of their unfortunate working people, are almost heart-breaking, and that many, many families, are on the very brink of starvation.

*Druff* alone, or mixed with oatmeal, has very generally been eaten; and it is stated to us, that there are instances in which even *horseflesh* has been taken as food! We are well assured that the present average earnings of each loom in the neighbourhood of Burnley, will not exceed three shillings and sixpence per week. The most industrious man, if fully employed as a weaver, could not possibly earn more than seven shillings; and there are manufacturers, who, for the purpose of ensuring some work to the whole of their people, restrict them to the weaving of two pieces of calico per week—for which they pay *two shillings and sixpence* and no more.

Macclesfield, Feb. 10. — Affairs here are daily growing worse, without the most remote appearance of improvement; and, to add to the distress into which we are plunged, the measures proposed by Ministers, relative to the withdrawing of 1*l.* and 2*l.* notes, are likely to have an effect never contemplated by Government. Some of the financial wiseacres who too often infest manufacturing districts, have put it abroad that they are immediately to be called in, and that those who hold them will be responsible for the loss. The consequence is, that for the last day or two there has been another "run"



on both of our highly respectable, and I may add, stable banking establishments, which, as might be expected, has proved excessively annoying and inconvenient. What may result from such movements it may not, perhaps, be difficult to discover. The insupportable trouble and expense which they entail on the banks will render the principals quite indifferent to the progress of business—where such a ridiculous and groundless want of confidence is manifested, it will most likely be met by the banks *refusing to accommodate with discounts*, and then, how the portion of wages we still have to pay is to be raised, *Heaven only knows*.

A Meeting of the principal tradesmen and manufacturers has taken place, in the Town Hall, where the subject underwent that discussion which its paramount importance demanded, and a declaration, expressive of the most unqualified confidence in the banks, was immediately agreed to.

It is computed that there are now about 15,000 hands out of employ here, from 5,000 to 6,000 of which are females.—Every day adds more to the appalling list; and although *potatoes, bread, and soup are delivered* to the most distressed families, the fund will soon become inadequate to the demands made upon it. Discontent, as had been anticipated, at last begins to manifest itself—and *maledictions against Ministers*, hitherto “not loud, but deep,” but now open and undisguised, are becoming very general. That customary forerunner of more extended mischief, placarding, already defaces the walls, and inscriptions of, “*Down with Huskisson*,” and “*No trade, no King*,” and “*Bread or blood*,” and “*Let us think of our starving families*,” have been pretty generally pasted up and written. Nearly 1,400 hands were bereaved of employ, the other day, by the stopping of Mr. Baker’s silk mill, and since then a commission has been opened against him, and the sale, which had been com-

menced by the Sheriff under a writ of *fieri facias*, is stopped. Numerous passes for Liverpool are daily signed by the Magistrates, for poor Irishmen and their families, who, having no employment here, prefer returning home to starve in their own country.

Such is a specimen of the effects of that pernicious paper-money, to which you have endeavoured to put an end. That the country should be reduced to such a state is enough to fill one with indignation; and what must be our feelings, then, when we perceive that, *even now*, there is no plan proposed, which can, to the mind of a rational man, afford the smallest chance of effectual and permanent relief. The papers of to-day announce to us, that another London banker has stopped, having eighteen country banks closely connected with him. Here is another mass of ruin; and nothing is done, and, as far as I can see, nothing contemplated, to secure justice to the unfortunate creatures who are to suffer by these repeated crashes. I have never imputed, and I do not now impute, evil design to the Ministers or the Parliament, in the measures which have produced these calamities; but so that we suffer, what to us is the question of design?

The measures now pending in Parliament will be efficient: that is to say, they will have *great effect*, or they will not. First, however, let me describe, as far as I am at present able, what these measures are. First, it is intended that there shall be branches of the Bank of England, and banks upon the Scotch plan. It signifies nothing upon what plan banking

is carried on. The question is solely a question of prices: it is a question of *gold circulation*, or *not gold circulation*. If there be gold circulation; if there be no *note under five pounds*, which is a gold circulation, then prices will be low, wheat will, on an average of years, be under four shillings the Winchester bushel; and, at the end of about three years, more than half the arable land will not pay a farthing of rent. *If there be a gold circulation*, it is a matter of perfect indifference of what description the banks be, or what may be their attempts to put out paper. Therefore, as to the new banking projects, they are wholly beneath our notice.

My sentiments upon this subject, I have thought proper to lay before the House of Commons in the form of a petition. That petition, together with the speech of the Noble Lord who did me the honour to present it, and that of the Hon. Member who did me the honour to speak in support of it.

Lord Folkestone said he had a petition to present to which he wished to call the attention of the House. It was signed by only one person, but that person had so distinguished himself upon the subjects to which it related, that he deserved particular attention. It was signed by William Cobbett, and related to a Bill now in progress through the House, to limit, and, after a certain period, prohibit the circulation of promissory notes. It stated that the petitioner had witnessed, in the course of the last sixteen years, a variety of changes with respect to the currency, all of which had been productive of the greatest calamities to the people; that while the measures were in progress he had uniformly predicted the consequences likely to ensue, and those predictions had turned out true; that he predicted the same conse-

quences in respect of the measure now before the House, unless it was accompanied by other measures; and he concluded with a prayer, that the House would repeal so much of the taxes as would reduce the taxation of the country to the state in which it was before the small paper money supplanted the coin of His Majesty. The Noble Lord observed that having himself a high opinion of the talents of this Gentleman, and agreeing with him in the opinions on this subject, he had great pleasure in presenting the petition, more especially, because he found it coincided with what he (Lord F.) had stated to the House on a former night. It did not petition the House not to pass the Bill—and he (Lord F.) had himself voted in support of the Bill—but it warned the House against the proceeding, without adopting other measures, in the belief that, if this measure was passed unaccompanied by other measures (which, however, were not in contemplation) the greatest calamities were likely to fall upon the country. He moved that the petition be brought up.

Col. Johnstone seconded the motion. He stated that he observed with regret that Ministers had relinquished the principles upon which they had set out; and he wished they would revert to their original intentions. He was sure that the whole of this petition, when considered in connexion with the prognostications, which the author had so frequently put forth, and which had been so thoroughly realized, would meet with every consideration from the House.

The petition was brought up, and read as follows:—

*To the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled.*

THE PETITION OF WILLIAM COBBETT, OF KENSINGTON, IN THE COUNTY OF MIDDLESEX,

Most humbly shows,

1. That your petitioner, perceiving that there is a Bill before your Honour-



able House, to limit, and after a certain period, to prohibit the circulation of "Promissory Notes, under a limited sum in England," most respectfully begs leave to pray your Honourable House to reflect on the evils that may proceed from such Bill, if unaccompanied by other measures, which other measures do not appear to be in the contemplation of your Honourable House.

2. That the last sixteen years have witnessed four sudden changes in the value of money; that every change has been attended with great masses of ruin; that, at every change, the working classes have been sunk deeper and deeper in poverty and in want, till, at last, they present a spectacle of human wretchedness and degradation, such as the world never before beheld; that all this ruin and misery have been caused by Acts passed by your Honourable House; and that previous to the passing of every one of these Acts, your humble petitioner has distinctly and publicly predicted the fatal consequences of the said Acts respectively, each and every of which has fulfilled his predictions to the very letter.

3. That in the above-mentioned Bill, now before your Honourable House, your humble Petitioner sees a design to cause gold and silver to be the circulating money of England; that he knows, as well as he knows fire burns, that if gold and silver be the circulating money of England, that more than half the present nominal amount of the taxes cannot be levied, without producing ruin and wretchedness absolutely insupportable; and that, therefore, while he expresses his profound gratitude to your Honourable House, for your laudable design to restore to the people the security given by His Majesty's coin, he most humbly but most earnestly prays your Honourable House to reduce the taxes to an amount not exceeding that which was their amount before the small paper-money supplanted the coin of His Majesty.—And your Petitioner will ever most humbly pray.

WILLIAM COBBETT.

Feb. 20, 1826.

It was then laid on the table, and on the motion of Lord Folkstone, ordered to be printed.]

Here the House and the nation have my opinion upon this subject recorded in the Journals of the House itself, and so distinctly and positively expressed, as to leave room for no cavil or shuffle. My former predictions were recorded only in my own works. Here is a record that every body may refer to, and that will, at all times, bear testimony against me if I am in error.

Now, with regard to the measure, intended to do away with the small paper-money, see how infirm the Ministers have been in their purpose. They saw the danger of this money, or rather this base thing bearing the name of money. They saw this danger with affright, and they are laudably resolved to get rid of it. But they had hardly formed the resolution, when they found themselves compelled to depart from it, and that, too, by those very ricks whose rags brought such ruin upon the country. The Ministers proposed, at first, to put an end to the villanous trash in six months: they then came to a year: then to three years: and now they propose to give to the Bank of England the power of making small notes for many months to come. Behold, then, how they stand before the country:

1. They say that a real circulation of coin is absolutely necessary to the safety of the people and of the State.
2. They say, that to have a circulation of coin along with small notes is absolutely impossible.
3. They propose to suffer all the present small notes to circulate for three years longer,

4. And they now propose to suffer the Bank of England to make new small notes, to *fill up the vacuum*, as they call it, for many months to come.

There they stand. Thus do they exhibit themselves to this distracted country. Can we, without some satisfaction, behold thus situated, those men who called the reformers "a low, degraded crew," who made a jest of the agonies of OGDEN, who passed the power-of-imprisonment Bill of 1817, and who proposed it to be enacted (and it was enacted) that any of us who uttered any thing having a *tendency* to bring them into contempt should be banished from our country for life? May we not, without subjecting ourselves to a charge even of want of feeling, bid them now resort to the aid of addresses from the Merchants and Bankers of London? Bid them now resort to the support of the Cotton Lords, of the yeomanry cavalry of Manchester, of Bolton Fletcher, of Parson Hay, and, though last, not least, of the Hampshire parsons. May not I, at any rate, bid them cry for help to those Lancashire magistrates, who imprisoned John Hayes for going round the town of Bolton to announce that William Cobbett had arrived, in good health, from America? May not I be permitted to bid them call for help on Lord Aylesford, and those who joined him in a threatening letter to a landlord to induce him to turn me out of his house?

If the Bank of England be permitted to make small notes, only until October next, there will be a great store always on hand.

They will not fill up the vacuum, as it is called; but, unless a penalty be inflicted on the rooks for attempting to foist them on the people in exchange for their own notes. Unless a penalty be inflicted on them in case they refuse gold payments, and tender this Bank paper in lieu of gold, unless this be done, the whole thing, the whole of the attempt to cause a gold circulation to take place, will become nugatory. Who is to *go to law* with a country rook? Who is to encounter the expenses of a law-suit, when refused payment in gold? Your case is the case that will happen to half the community. The paper will continue to circulate for another year or so, the people will continue to be ruined, and the Quakers will continue to flourish. What may happen during that time, no man can say, but, at any rate, there will be none of that circulation which the Ministers have declared to be so necessary to the people and the state, and the whole of this grand measure will melt into air.

A small bundle of Bank of England notes will be quite sufficient for any one rook. The demand for gold from the country rooks, has every where been stopped. The instant they produced their legal tender, as they have the audacity to call it; for, little as the people like the money of the rag-rooks, they like it better than small Bank of England paper, which they have never liked, which they know to be liable to forgeries, and which they never will take if they can get any thing else. The runs upon scores of the country banks, were stopped in a moment by the tender of



Bank of England notes, and this tender is made with a degree of effrontery such as nobody but Quakers are capable of. "We are sorry, friend, that thou dost not like this paper, but we have nothing else for thee." This has been their conduct all over the country, and the present intended measure is, therefore, a mere mockery on the country, unless there be a heavy penalty for refusing to pay in gold, under pretence of a tender in Bank of England notes. At the very moment that this Bill is in Committee before the House of Commons, this sort of refusal is going on all over the country; and this is as notorious, too, as the sun at noon-day.

It has been stated in the reports of some of the newspapers, that, when Mr. HUME, on Monday night last, proposed, not a penalty, but a *summary process*, agreeably to the old law; that is to say, if a country banker refused payment in gold and tendered Bank of England notes, he should be liable to *have his goods seized in payment, at the end of three days*; when Mr. HUME most laudably proposed this, it is reported, that Mr. GURNEY said, that *nobody would then be a country banker*. Indeed! Does not this speak plain? Does not this show you what the rooks rely on? Why should they object to summary process, if they sincerely meant to pay in gold according to the law? Let them pay in gold, according to the law, and there will be no process at all. If they wish to prevent a provision of this sort being introduced into the Bill, it will be as clear as daylight that they intend to continue their prac-

tice of refusing gold, under pretence of a legal tender of Bank of England notes; and, if they be permitted to fulfil this intention, all the endeavours of the Ministers to obtain a circulating coin will be blasted, and we shall never see real money circulate again until the whole system has been blown to pieces by some terrible convulsion.

These rag-rooks, in the fulness of their insolence, are pleased to consider their rags as being evidence *merely of a debt*, merely of an ordinary debt due from man to man. They forget that their rags are payable to bearer on demand; they choose to forget that it is money, circulating money which they issue, and by which they gain great profit, without value given in return. They choose to forget, that they are invested with the King's prerogative of making money; and that, in every view that can be taken in the matter, he who refuses to pay his bank note in gold, bears no resemblance to a common debtor. Actions of debt are brought, because the party owing the debt may *possibly not owe it*; the action is instituted to try the fact, whether the debt be due or not. But, here is no such doubt; here is no uncertainty; here the party cannot deny that he owes the sum. The note itself is the evidence of the debt, and evidence also that it is due to the bearer of the note. What! are these men to be invested with one of the greatest prerogatives of the King; are they to make money to be circulated amongst the King's subjects; are they to have the profits of the coinage; are they to have all these advantages; are they to en-

oy them under a license; and, jare they to tell the party that holds the money, to go to the Courts of law, as the only means of obtaining its worth from them! Was there ever any thing heard of before so monstrous as this insolence?

Yet, if I were called upon to say what I think will be the result, I should have no hesitation in saying that I thought it would be a triumph on the part of the rooks. In my second lecture to the Mechanics, I described the power that these men would have, if they chose, of dictating to the government. The government appears to have felt their power already. The rooks have threatened them with putting a stop to the circulation of their paper. This has been announced from several quarters, and I have no doubt that the Ministers are greatly alarmed at their proceedings. They have the power of doing a great deal of present mischief; but, the wise course would be for the Government to face them at once; to cause the nature of their hostile proceedings to be clearly understood by the people, to appeal to the good sense and public spirit of the people upon the subject, to give magistrates and parish officers full power to make effectual provision for the poor, and for all persons in a state of distress, to make every particle of property of the rooks liable for the whole of the notes that they have out, and that, too, by some very summary process, to seize, in short, upon this many-headed monster, with a resolute hand, and extinguish it for ever. If the Ministers were to adopt this course, they would have ninety-nine hun-

dredths of the people with them; but, as long as they continue balancing and hesitating; as long as they continue to make it doubtful who are to be the money-makers in future, so long will they be thwarted and embarrassed by the rooks, who will, in the long-run become completely their masters. If this be the case, there is a terrible Revolution in store for us, but, at any rate, you will have the satisfaction of reflecting that you have done much more than your fair proportion of the work of endeavouring to prevent such result.

I do not like to conclude, without begging you to notice the very great part that the *Quakers* have performed in the producing of these calamities. I believe that one-half, full one half, of the breakings have taken place amongst this meek-looking, and most coolly insolent tribe: none of whom ever work at any thing, except at the changing and chopping of money or of goods. They produce nothing from their labour, and they very rarely follow any of those pursuits by which commodities are augmented in their value by the labour bestowed upon them. They step in between the grower, or the maker, and the consumer; and they get their money by just handing the goods from one to the other. They are mere traffickers, and the whole tribe is of this description. No wonder that there are so many of them paper-money makers. I was wrong in saying that they never *made* any thing, for they make money in abundance. That, however, is a sort of manufacture which forms an exception from the general rule. It is surprising with what coolness they announce



their stoppage. They never cut their throats, not they. They take all "in the quiet," and, while the people are starving around them, they are as sleek and as fat as moles. The Jews are really an amiable crew, compared to them: they do not exceed them in greediness, and they are not half a match for them in insolence. Down they come, however, with the paper system, and I do hope to see the sleek vagabonds compelled to do work for their bread. There is a terrible smash amongst them at New York; that smash is now recoiling upon Liverpool; and there is one fellow at Liverpool, of whom, I am given to understand, we are likely soon to hear a pretty good account. This is gun-boat No. 1. of the tribe. If he goes down, a whole fleet of small craft will follow him.

I am, Sir,

Your most obedient

Humble Servant,

WM. COBBETT.

P. S. You have heard of Smith, one Bott Smith, of Liverpool, who is, I understand, actually going mad. He rails, I am told, through two whole columns, once a week, and is laughed at for his pains by the few persons in that town, who are not justly smarting under the scourge of paper-money.

### "THE UNNY MAN"

*For Matchless Blacking and for Law.*

When the "UNNY MAN" appeared, the other day, at our

Meeting at the Freemason's Tavern, people were a good deal puzzled to know *what he would be at*. Some thought that he was only anxious that my *purity* should be preserved; but, when he said that he was ready with his "*mite*"; "with your *spite*, you mean," said a gentleman in the crowd, and he said it quite loud enough for the "Unny Man" to hear him. The following report of a trial, which took place on Monday last, may serve to explain all this. I insert the Report, word for word, as I find it in the Morning Herald; and when I have inserted it, I shall add a few short remarks.

### COURT OF KING'S BENCH, Monday, Feb. 20, 1826.

HUNT v. COBBETT.

This cause, which appeared to excite considerable interest, came on to be tried by the LORD CHIEF JUSTICE, and a *Special Jury*.

The pleadings were opened by Mr. HILL, who defined the action as one brought by the plaintiff to recover damages for the publication of a libel, founded upon the testimony given by the plaintiff in the cause of *Byrne v. Parkins*.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL stated the case. The parties in the cause, Mr. Hunt, the plaintiff, as well as the defendant, Mr. Cobbett, must necessarily be too well known—the names of both had been too long before the public to require from him any particular description. The present action had been brought by Mr. Hunt, for the purpose of vindicating his character from the unmerited and foul aspersions cast upon it by the defendant. On the part of the plain-

tiff, he would have said, if the libel of which he complained embodied a mere general attack—if it contained nothing more than an indiscriminate abuse of his private and public conduct, that his best instruments of retaliation would be silence and contempt; and the vindication upon which he could most safely and most honourably rely was the respectability of his character. But there were some charges so particular and distinct in their tendency, affecting so strongly the moral character of those who were made the victims of them, so definite, so specific in their nature, that it became incumbent upon the individual who valued his character, who respected his station in society, or who attached any importance to the estimation of the world, to defend himself against the malignant fabrication, and thus, at the same time, to give to the person preferring such charges, an opportunity of asserting them in a Court of Justice, and, if he could, of proving their truth. It was the right of him whose character was traduced, or his good name vilified, to demand inquiry, and to claim the restitution of his fame. The plaintiff in this action, a man occupying a respectable station in society, had been charged by Mr. Cobbett with perjury, alleged to have been committed by him in his evidence on a trial in that Court. Such a charge, conveying, as it did, the most debasing stigma upon the human character, became a proper subject of judicial investigation. The plaintiff might, if he pleased, have had recourse to a criminal prosecution for the libel upon his character; but if he had resorted to such a mode of vindication, Mr. Cobbett would have turned round and said, "It is true I have made this charge against you, but the course you have adopted debars me of the opportunity of justifying it by giving proof of its truth. In an indictment for a libel, the author could derive no shelter from the truth of its allegations: their truth or falsehood could not be investigated

in that course of proceeding; and therefore Mr. Hunt had been advised, and properly advised, to bring the action in its present form, so as to furnish the defendant with an opportunity of putting a justification on the record. What, then, would the Jury think of the conduct of Mr. Cobbett, who, after having made these charges against Mr. Hunt, in a publication of such extensive circulation, now, when an opportunity was given him of justifying them, and establishing their untruth, shrunk from the investigation, and, instead of attempting any justification of his charges, pleaded "not guilty," and thus, in fact, said, "I never preferred such charges against you." This was the general nature of the case which he (the Attorney-General) had to lay before the Jury; and before directing their attention to the terms of the libel itself, he would beg leave to put them in possession of the circumstances out of which it grew. It happened some time back, that a person of the name of Byrne, a man in an humble station of life, came over to this country, on the invitation, as he (the Attorney-General) believed, either of Mr. Cobbett, or of a Mr. Parkins, of whom also the Jury must before now have heard something, and who was formerly one of the Sheriffs of London. This person was received by Mr. Parkins, who opened a subscription in order to requite him for the wrongs and persecutions which he was considered to have sustained. Mr. Parkins was the person who was most active and prominent in collecting these subscriptions, but a number of other persons, and amongst them Mr. Cobbett, employed themselves in the receipt of money for the same purpose. Something then was received in this way by Mr. Cobbett, and handed over to Mr. Parkins. He did not mean to enter into the disputes between Mr. Cobbett and Mr. Parkins. It unfortunately happened in general, when any cause was brought into Court, in which Mr



Cobbett was a party concerned, that its discussion was protracted and embarrassed by the introduction of much collateral matter unconnected with the question at issue. Of this, he (the Attorney-General) was anxious to steer clear. The individual to whom he had alluded (Byrne) conceived himself not to have been fairly dealt with by Mr. Parkins, in the settlement of the account of subscriptions received for him, and he accordingly brought an action, which was tried in that Court by a Common Jury, and in which he recovered damages to the amount of 196*l.*, being the sum which the Jury considered equivalent to the deficiency of which he complained at the hands of Parkins. Mr. Parkins was not, however, satisfied with this verdict, and he applied for a new trial, which was granted, and took place before a Special Jury, and on that occasion the verdict was reduced to 150*l.* or 160*l.*, which sum was afterwards paid to Byrne by Mr. Parkins, and so that transaction ended. On the second trial Mr. Hunt was examined as a witness on behalf of Mr. Parkins. There was no connexion between Mr. Hunt and Mr. Parkins, and his being subpoenaed to give evidence on that trial was quite contrary to Mr. Hunt's inclination, insomuch that he refused to have any previous communication with the person who called to take his evidence, saying, that if he should be examined he would tell whatever he knew of the transaction, but until then he would not hold any intercourse on the subject. Afterwards, however, he yielded to a subpoena, which he could not dare to disobey, and appeared as a witness for Mr. Parkins. In answer to a question put to him by Mr. Parkins, who conducted his own defence, Mr. Hunt stated that Byrne had called upon him, and in the course of conversation mentioned in substance, that Mr. Cobbett had not paid over to Mr. Parkins all the money that he had received from him, and spoke in very abusive

terms of Mr. Cobbett. Mr. Hunt had nothing to do with this transaction. Whether or not Mr. Cobbett had misconducted himself in the manner imputed to him was not the question, but Mr. Hunt swore in the witness's box that he had received information to that effect from Byrne, who, he also stated, spoke at the same time, in the most favourable terms of Parkins. This was the only part of the evidence given on that occasion, which was at all relevant to the present question. Mr. Hunt was very much surprised in some days after this trial, to find his name connected, in a publication of the defendant's, with a long article, containing observations upon the merits of the case, and embodying strictures upon all those (he believed even the Counsel themselves) who had taken part in the trial. In this article Mr. Hunt was charged with having perjured himself in the evidence given by him. A man enjoying a respectable station in life, in no way interested for either of the parties in the cause, who had no connexion with Mr. Parkins, and was dissatisfied with Byrne for the inconsistency of his representation—at one time condemning Mr. Cobbett, and again complaining of Mr. Parkins—the man who came into Court to give his conscientious testimony under these circumstances was accused, without the imputation of any motive, of having committed one of the lowest and most profligate crimes by which the human character could be debased. It was true, that Mr. Cobbett admitted that he was not present when Mr. Hunt's testimony was delivered, but the man who acted upon the representations of others in making them the foundation of an attack upon character, made himself responsible for their accuracy and truth. The Learned Gentlemen here read and commented upon the publication complained of, which is as follows:—

In the meanwhile, I shall conclude what I have now to say upon the subject, by inserting an affidavit of Byrne,

which I take from the *Dublin Morning Register* of the 9th of May. I should first observe, however, that on the last trial, there came as a witness for Parkins, Mr. Henry Hunt. I was not in Court when Mr. Hunt was examined; but I read in the *Morning Chronicle* that Mr. Hunt said, that Byrne spoke evil of me to him (Mr. Hunt), and complained that he could not get from me the subscription money that I received for him. Mr. Hunt said that, at this time, when Byrne complained of me, he spoke greatly in praise of Parkins. This appeared to be the most wonderful thing in the world, for I never made any collections for Byrne, until after the first trial took place; therefore I could have none of his money till after that trial; and surely the man must have been in a mad fit if he spoke in praise of Parkins after that trial! The public will understand that there were two subscriptions for Byrne; Parkins made himself the treasurer of the first; he collected money in various ways. He had tin boxes put up at twenty or thirty places in London—one of which boxes was at my shop in Fleet-street; so that I never had any money of Byrne's in my hands belonging to this first subscription. I received money, but I paid it to Parkins. Even the money put into my hands at the dinner, I handed over to Parkins. Therefore it is the strangest thing in the world that Byrne should have complained to Mr. Hunt of me while he was speaking handsomely of Parkins. The second subscription was made by me; but this was after the first trial. The moment that trial was over, I began to advance Byrne something weekly for him and his daughter to live upon. It is barely possible, that, while this subscription was going on, Byrne might have complained of me to Mr. Hunt; but then, observe, it is absolutely impossible that Byrne could, at the same time, have spoken in praise of Parkins. And here I have to notice the base and wicked conduct of the London newspapers. The *Morning Chronicle*, for instance, inserted this evidence of Mr. Hunt; but it took special care to leave out the evidence of Mr. Charles Clement, who said that I never touched Byrne's money, that he, Mr. Clement, received it. That he kept an account of it; that he advanced money to Byrne as he wanted it, that he paid him over the balance

some time in July last; that he took his receipt for that balance; and that, to the very last hour of Byrne's remaining in London, he continued to express, upon all occasions, his gratitude towards me; and that when he went away he left his daughter in my house. This evidence, that black-hearted newspaper took special care to omit; and this, amongst a thousand others that I could cite, is a proof of the mischievous tendency of publishing reports of trials in the manner in which they are now published.

I have now only to add the affidavit of Byrne, published as above-mentioned; but I cannot insert it without distinctly saying that *I believe every word of it to be true*. The reader will be better able to judge for himself, when told that there was scarcely a day, for the last twelve months that Byrne was in England, when he was not at one or the other of my houses, where there was always victuals and drink for him, three times in the day if he chose it. Every Sunday he and his family, and, after Mrs. Byrne and her smaller children went away, he and his daughter dined and drank tea at my house at Kensington, and this, observe, to the very last Sunday of his being in London. Let the reader judge for himself then. Here is Byrne's affidavit, and again I say I believe every word of it to be true.

*Poor Byrne—Parkins—Henry Hunt.*

County of the City of Dublin, to Wit.  
—James Byrne, of the City of Dublin, coachman, maketh Oath on the Holy Evangelists, that in a report of the proceedings of the English Court of King's Bench, in the case of Byrne and Parkins, he the deponent saw an assertion, purporting to have been made by Henry Hunt, to the effect, that he the deponent spoke to the said Hunt of William Cobbett, Esq. in abusive terms, and cast reflections on the integrity of Mr. Cobbett. Deponent solemnly swears that this assertion is totally false and unfounded; and that he never spoke to said Hunt disrespectfully or injuriously of Mr. Cobbett; and that, if he had done so, he would be guilty of the blackest ingratitude: Mr. Cobbett and all his family having acted towards said deponent and his family with a generosity and kindness that totally



surpasses his powers of description, and shall remain engraven on his heart to the latest hour of his existence.

JAMES BYRNE,

Sworn before me this 29th day of April, 1825.

DRURY JONES.

The Learned Attorney - General continued—He would ask the Jury, if, looking to the style and phraseology of this affidavit, they could believe Byrne to be the author of it? No: it was quite obvious that, even if sworn by Byrne, of which there was nothing that constituted a legal proof, it had been drawn up by another hand, probably by Mr. Cobbett, or by his son, who was at that time in Ireland. But let the Jury mark the dexterity of Mr. Cobbett. He would lead the world to believe that this was a testimony on oath worthy of being opposed to Mr. Hunt's swearing, and that Mr. Hunt's evidence on the trial was contradicted by a deposition of equal authority and value, while at the same time he knew full well that the man who made a voluntary deposition on oath, did so without any sanction which the law acknowledged, and that even if every word contained in Byrne's affidavit were untrue, he could not be indicted for perjury under it. This was the evidence which he put in competition with the formal and solemn swearing of a witness summoned to give evidence in a Court of Justice. All these particulars Mr. Cobbett was fully in possession of. And therefore he was endeavouring to impose upon the world, when he placed such evidence in competition with that of Mr. Hunt, as if incurring similar penalties, and therefore entitled to equal credit. But, supposing all that the affidavit contained to be true, why did not Byrne appear and substantiate it? Where was he? Why did he not come forward in that Court, as a witness, to prove that what Mr. Hunt had sworn was false? Because it was well known, that if he should be asked at whose desire he subscribed the affidavit; by whose

pen it was drawn; by whose attestation it was preceded and followed?—he must have acknowledged, that it was to Mr. Cobbett it owed its origin and essence. Had Mr. Cobbett been taken by surprise? No: the present action had been long pending. Mr. Cobbett had, in fact, put a sort of justification upon the record; but this he afterwards withdrew, and contented himself with a mere general plea, that he was not guilty of having made the charges against Mr. Hunt. The plaintiff had, he could have, but one object in view—to redeem his character, which had been basely slandered; to repel the calumnies with which he had been reviled without a pretext. Mr. Cobbett, who had the courage to make these charges in the face of the public, was not bold enough to attempt to sustain them before a Jury of his countrymen. He virtually admitted, by the plea he had put in, that the imputations against Mr. Hunt had no foundation. He said, "*I have imputed to you perjury, the lowest and blackest crime of which any man of respectable station in society can be arraigned, and admit that the charge is false, and that I am a foul calumniator.*" Mr. Hunt, then under these circumstances, came before a Jury of his countrymen to seek compensation for the injury done to his reputation. There was no engine so powerfully available, where character is concerned, as the periodical Press; and no portion of that Press was more powerful than that which was conducted by the defendant. He the Attorney-General did not advance this assertion from his own feelings or his own experience, nor did he appeal as he might do, to the testimony of all who heard him, but he spoke on the authority of Mr. Cobbett himself, who in his publication not a fortnight back, described himself as "possessing extraordinary powers." (Extraordinary certainly, where character was to be destroyed.) This was Mr. Cobbett's own description of his capabilities,

and on that let the Jury find their estimate of the compensation which would be reasonable for the injury done to his client. He had thus endeavoured to lay the case simply before them, stripping it of all collateral circumstances, and of every thing that was not intimately and properly referable to the question at issue. What imputation could be so degrading or so injurious as that of falsehood? Yet that was not the extent of the baseness with which Mr. Hunt was charged by the defendant. *He was accused of having disregarded the solemn obligation of an oath, and of having been guilty of the basest and most deliberate perjury.* This charge had been sent forth to the world; it was written in Mr. Cobbett's ordinary manner, and trumpeted forth in his publication, *which circulated not only to every corner of this island, but reached even to the remotest extremities of the empire, and was known wherever the English language was understood.* It was powerful, as Mr. Cobbett himself characterized it, either for upholding or destroying character. The Jury then would shew the sense they entertained of the inestimable value of character, by assigning such damages, as although they might not amount to a compensation for the injury inflicted, would be the means of deterring from its repetition.

Mr. James Mallison, a clerk in the Stamp-office, proved the publication of the *Register* of the 14th of May, 1825.

Mr. Charles Clement proved himself to be the printer and publisher, and Mr. Cobbett the sole proprietor of the *Register*.

Charles Swift deposed, that he was present at the second trial between Byrne and Parkins, and that on that occasion, Mr. Hunt, in his examination on behalf of the defendant, stated, *that Byrne called upon him at one time and stated that Mr. Cobbett had received money for him, Byrne, which neither he nor Mr. Parkins had been able to get from him, that Mr.*

Hunt went on in his evidence to say, that Byrne called upon him a second time, and then abused Mr. Parkins, although at the first interview, he had said, *that Mr. Parkins was every thing that was delightful.* Mr. Hunt was subpoenaed on that trial by Mr. Parkins. Witness had himself made many ineffectual attempts to serve him with a subpoena.

This witness was cross-examined by Mr. PHILLIPS, and answered that he was present at both trials between Byrne and Parkins. Witness was in the employment of Mr. Parkins; he took notes of the evidence of nearly all the witnesses. Did not hear Mr. Hunt say, in the presence of Mr. Parkins, that he (Hunt) was there by accident, and had not been subpoenaed. Witness was present during the whole trial; there was no short-hand writer employed by Mr. Parkins to take a report of the trial. Witness was backward and forward in Court assisting Mr. Parkins.—Does not mean to say that he took notes of one-third of the trial. Mr. Cobbett was examined on both the trials. Witness knew nothing of Mr. Hunt, except that he was a blacking-manufacturer.

The plaintiff's case closed here.

Mr. CHARLES PHILLIPS, in rising to address the Jury, on behalf of the defendant, assured them that he should feel, in an ordinary case, a degree of embarrassment if opposed by the Learned Attorney General, whose clear and eloquent appeals were felt by all who heard them, but his difficulties were enhanced in a case of libel like the present. In this species of action the defendant always laboured under considerable difficulties. If he did not justify, he was considered as having advanced that which was not true, and if he did put in a plea of justification, and if in any one particular he failed proving that which he justified, it would be prejudicial to his cause. In an action of this description, it was necessary for the party bringing it, that he might obtain the



protection of the law, to prove that there was malice expressed or implied in the alleged libel; and before a verdict could pass against the defendant, it ought to be shewn that either the publication was malicious on the face of it, or that it could be inferred. He would beg leave to ask, what were the guides which would conduct to such a conclusion? They ought to be such in which a Jury could not possibly be mistaken as to the intention of the writer. It was necessary to shew that the epithets of the publication were abusive, or that the arguments were calculated to bring public contempt on the party about whom they were addressed, or that personal abuse was introduced into the subject, or that it was sought by wandering out of the subject for the purposes of slander. These were the guides which ought to govern a Jury in their decision. If such things as the above were not discovered in any publication, if they were all absent, then, indeed the publication complained of would be harmless. The meaning ought to be obvious—there should be no obscurity—the judgment should not be warped in order to arrive at such a conclusion as the plaintiff wishes to be drawn. The best principles of policy—aye, and of mercy, were those which put upon any thing of a doubtful nature the best construction. This was what guided benevolent men in judging of each other's actions. He would not administer, and he trusted the Jury would not either, to the morbid sensibility of any person who was anxious to discover that which never existed; but, on the contrary, he would endeavour to show, if an individual wished to ascribe the worst motives to doubtful actions, that they had not their origin in such a source. These were the principles upon which he meant to found his defence; and he believed he might assume it as a fact, that there was no malice obvious upon the face of the publication. He trusted, further, that he

should show by argument, that, so far from Mr. Cobbett hunting out for an opportunity to speak of Mr. Hunt, it was actually forced upon him from the events themselves, over which he had no control. There was not an offensive epithet applied to Mr. Hunt in the alleged libel, and so far was Mr. Cobbett from imputing blame to him, that the alleged libel reflected the highest honour upon Mr. Hunt's character. He (the Learned Counsel) was at a loss to conceive what was sought by the publication. Pecuniary loss there was none—not one farthing; and as for loss of character, on the part of Mr. Hunt, that gentleman need be under no apprehension about losing his character. If he were under no disturbed feelings, no reflections but which the publication caused, he might rest contented, and, indeed, deservedly so, for he must be a pure man, and could have no gnawings of conscience. He must be one of the most timid men in nature, if he supposed that the publication in question was likely to cause any one to think differently of his character from what was the opinion before the publication.—(Laughter.) It became his (Mr. Phillips's) duty towards his client to read over the whole of the supposed libel, because a construction had been put upon it which in truth it did not bear. (The Learned Counsel then read the passage, making very few remarks as he went along.) He begged the Jury's attention to one fact, which was, that there was not a single expression of an offensive nature towards Mr. Hunt in the publication—his name was used throughout in a respectful manner. The Learned Gentleman said he would pass by the circumstances by which the individual Byrne was introduced to the notice of the public—the almost miraculous way in which he stood redeemed from the imputation cast upon him. That individual had shaken off the dust from his prison door, was at large again, and the world was before him; but

He was nearly heart-broken because of the stigma which then attached to his character, and nothing but the public voice, could, after the circumstances produced, reinstate him again in that scale from which he had been cast. He, it was a matter of perfect notoriety, came over to this country, and it was grievous to think, that some advantages were taken of his misfortunes. It was not necessary to allude to the two trials in which Parkins was engaged. Mr. Cobbett was engaged as a witness in them. He (the Learned Counsel) was not there to pronounce an eulogium on Mr. Cobbett's character. Great as his talents were, and much as they were approved, it was a still greater gratification to know that the deeds which he had accomplished to benefit a fellow creature in distress, were of a more satisfactory nature, and left a more animating reflection behind. Mr. Cobbett had befriended, in no small degree, an oppressed individual, who, indeed, was an object of national benevolence. But in this work of charity the part which Mr. Cobbett took was very conspicuous. Byrne was raised from the very depths of misery to comparative ease, and then, as represented in one of the Morning Papers, he was said to have abused his benefactor. The Jury would, of course, make every allowance for expressions used on such an occasion by Mr. Cobbett, supposing him to have been under the influence of feelings at witnessing his kindness being thus treated. If Byrne had really been guilty of such ingratitude, what language was too strong to apply towards him? But he was not, and Mr. Cobbett knew it. Had Byrne thus spoken of one who had raised him from despair to hope, from poverty to competence, what terms would be equal to describe such a monster? What did Mr. Cobbett do? He charged the *Morning Chronicle* with giving a false and garbled account of the trial in which Byrne and Parkins were parties. "This was the head

and front of his offending." It was a little singular that Mr. Hunt should bring an action against Mr. Cobbett on such an alleged libel as that which had been read. Had the proprietors of the *Morning Chronicle* chosen to bring an action; it would have been less surprising, seeing that paper was attacked for putting forth a garbled account of the trial. Mr. Cobbett never denied that Mr. Hunt gave the evidence imputed to him. All that he says is, that he was out of Court at the time. He did not use a syllable of acrimony or complaint towards Mr. Hunt. If the *Chronicle* had given a true report, it was a little singular that a prosecution had not been commenced against Mr. Cobbett, inasmuch as he charged the report with being a garbled one, and denied its accuracy. He gave his reasons for that opinion, and in none of them was there any thing to distress even the most fastidious man: nor was there the least reflection upon Mr. Hunt's character, in any one of them. In the first place, Mr. Cobbett expressed his belief that the report in the *Chronicle* was garbled. And why does he say so? Because it suppressed part of the evidence. He charges the report of the trial as having been wilfully misrepresented by the *Chronicle*, and, as far as he goes, imputes deliberate misrepresentation for the purpose of injuring him. With respect to Byrne, he never once believes that Byrne could have used the expressions attributed to him in the report. And for entertaining such an opinion, he gives a very good and honourable reason—viz. that he had been the benefactor of Byrne, and it was not in human nature to heap abuse upon him for having so highly benefited a fellow-creature in distress. He (the Learned Gentleman) would not believe that Byrne praised Parkins, even if he admitted, which he would not do, that Byrne had abused the defendant. It was impossible for Byrne to extol a man who was so much his private



enemy as Parkins had then proved himself to be. As to the evidence which had been given that day of Mr. Hunt's examination at the trial so frequently alluded to, it was the most extraordinary that could be conceived. A witness was called to prove what that gentleman said. This witness did not take notes for more than one-third of the evidence, according to his own account. He was in and out of Court during the trial, and could not be present all the time that the proceedings were going forward. (The Learned Counsel was reflecting on the credit of a witness examined on a former trial, when the Lord Chief Justice interposed.) It was impossible, continued the Learned Gentleman, at this distant time, to recollect exactly what Mr. Hunt said on that trial, which lasted eleven hours, but this he recollected, that Mr. Hunt was called as a witness for the defendant Parkins, and that a verdict was obtained by Byrne. Why was not the reporter called who took notes of the proceedings? This was better evidence than calling a witness who only heard part of the case. But the reporter had been studiously kept back. This, however, he would venture to advance, that if even the reporter had been called, and had sworn that Mr. Hunt asserted on the trial, that Byrne abused Cobbett, he (Mr. Phillips) would not believe it. And if the reporter had further declared that Mr. Hunt swore that Byrne praised Parkins, this assertion as far as regarded Byrne was equally unworthy of credit. It was contrary to experience, to our habits, to believe that the oppressor could be praised by the oppressed. Why, if such things as these occurred with Byrne, he wrought a miracle that his patron Saint never equalled.—(A laugh.) Let the Jury consider for a moment the relation the parties bore towards each other. Byrne wanted the money collected for him, which was in Parkins's hands, and Parkins refused to advance it, therefore, it was not very likely that

a man refusing what in justice he was bound to give up, would be extolled by the individual, towards whom he thus acted. After repeated solicitations without effect, it came to the knowledge of Mr. Harmer, a gentleman who stood high in the estimation of all who knew his integrity, in what way Byrne had been treated, and he undertook the action which was first brought. At this time Byrne was living upon the benefactions of Mr. Cobbett. The Learned Counsel said he would not believe that Byrne would have spoken in praise of Parkins. He would as soon believe that snow and fire would unite and form one common element, or that the tiger and its prey would lie down in peace together! Parkins, although a verdict passed against him, refused to disburse the money which a Jury had decided he had obtained for Byrne, and the latter was obliged to wait the result of a second trial, which the former by means of affidavits, obtained. Thus was Byrne wearied by the law's delay, and distressed by its expense, but at length the money was wrested from the iron grasp of avarice. It was almost incredible to believe to what a degree of heartlessness did Parkins go. The Attorney General had been pleased to say, that had Mr. Cobbett meant to impute perjury to Mr. Hunt, a justification should have been put upon the record. It was further observed that at first a kind of justification was put on the record, but afterwards withdrawn. Mr. Cobbett did not mean nor did he ever impute perjury to Mr. Hunt. That gentleman would leave the Court with as fair a character as ever he had. All that Mr. Cobbett insisted upon was, that a garbled report of the trial appeared in the *Chronicle*, for the express purpose of injuring him. The Attorney General had addressed the Jury on the power of the Press. He (Mr. Phillips) was not standing there to do away with the impression thus created, neither should he appeal to

He was nearly heart-broken because of the stigma which then attached to his character, and nothing but the public voice, could, after the circumstances produced, reinstate him again in that scale from which he had been cast. He, it was a matter of perfect notoriety, came over to this country, and it was grievous to think, that some advantages were taken of his misfortunes. It was not necessary to allude to the two trials in which Parkins was engaged. Mr. Cobbett was engaged as a witness in them. He (the Learned Counsel) was not there to pronounce an eulogium on Mr. Cobbett's character. Great as his talents were, and much as they were approved, it was a still greater gratification to know that the deeds which he had accomplished to benefit a fellow creature in distress, were of a more satisfactory nature, and left a more animating reflection behind. Mr. Cobbett had befriended, in no small degree, an oppressed individual, who, indeed, was an object of national benevolence. But in this work of charity the part which Mr. Cobbett took was very conspicuous. Byrne was raised from the very depths of misery to comparative ease, and then, as represented in one of the Morning Papers, he was said to have abused his benefactor. The Jury would, of course, make every allowance for expressions used on such an occasion by Mr. Cobbett, supposing him to have been under the influence of feelings at witnessing his kindness being thus treated. If Byrne had really been guilty of such ingratitude, what language was too strong to apply towards him? But he was not, and Mr. Cobbett knew it. Had Byrne thus spoken of one who had raised him from despair to hope, from poverty to competence, what terms would be equal to describe such a monster? What did Mr. Cobbett do? He charged the *Morning Chronicle* with giving a false and garbled account of the trial in which Byrne and Parkins were parties. "This was the head

and front of his offending." It was a little singular that Mr. Hunt should bring an action against Mr. Cobbett on such an alleged libel as that which had been read. Had the proprietors of the *Morning Chronicle* chosen to bring an action, it would have been less surprising, seeing that paper was attacked for putting forth a garbled account of the trial. Mr. Cobbett never denied that Mr. Hunt gave the evidence imputed to him. All that he says is, that he was out of Court at the time. He did not use a syllable of acrimony or complaint towards Mr. Hunt. If the *Chronicle* had given a true report, it was a little singular that a prosecution had not been commenced against Mr. Cobbett, inasmuch as he charged the report with being a garbled one, and denied its accuracy. He gave his reasons for that opinion, and in none of them was there any thing to distress even the most fastidious man: nor was there the least reflection upon Mr. Hunt's character, in any one of them. In the first place, Mr. Cobbett expressed his belief that the report in the *Chronicle* was garbled. And why does he say so? Because it suppressed part of the evidence. He charges the report of the trial as having been wilfully misrepresented by the *Chronicle*, and, as far as he goes, imputes deliberate misrepresentation for the purpose of injuring him. With respect to Byrne, he never once believes that Byrne could have used the expressions attributed to him in the report. And for entertaining such an opinion, he gives a very good and honourable reason—viz. that he had been the benefactor of Byrne, and it was not in human nature to heap abuse upon him for having so highly benefited a fellow-creature in distress. He (the Learned Gentleman) would not believe that Byrne praised Parkins, even if he admitted, which he would not do, that Byrne had abused the defendant. It was impossible for Byrne to extol a man who was so much his private



enemy as Parkins had then proved himself to be. As to the evidence which had been given that day of Mr. Hunt's examination at the trial so frequently alluded to, it was the most extraordinary that could be conceived. A witness was called to prove what that gentleman said. This witness did not take notes for more than one-third of the evidence, according to his own account. He was in and out of Court during the trial, and could not be present all the time that the proceedings were going forward. (The Learned Counsel was reflecting on the credit of a witness examined on a former trial, when the Lord Chief Justice interposed.) It was impossible, continued the Learned Gentleman, at this distant time, to recollect exactly what Mr. Hunt said on that trial, which lasted eleven hours, but this he recollected, that Mr. Hunt was called as a witness for the defendant Parkins, and that a verdict was obtained by Byrne. Why was not the reporter called who took notes of the proceedings? This was better evidence than calling a witness who only heard part of the case. But the reporter had been studiously kept back. This, however, he would venture to advance, that if even the reporter had been called, and had sworn that Mr. Hunt asserted on the trial, that Byrne abused Cobbett, he (Mr. Phillips) would not believe it. And if the reporter had further declared that Mr. Hunt swore that Byrne praised Parkins, this assertion as far as regarded Byrne was equally unworthy of credit. It was contrary to experience, to our habits, to believe that the oppressor could be praised by the oppressed. Why, if such things as these occurred with Byrne, he wrought a miracle that his patron Saint never equalled.—(A laugh.) Let the Jury consider for a moment the relation the parties bore towards each other. Byrne wanted the money collected for him, which was in Parkins's hands, and Parkins refused to advance it, therefore, it was not very likely that

a man refusing what in justice he was bound to give up, would be extolled by the individual, towards whom he thus acted. After repeated solicitations without effect, it came to the knowledge of Mr. Harmer, a gentleman who stood high in the estimation of all who knew his integrity, in what way Byrne had been treated, and he undertook the action which was first brought. At this time Byrne was living upon the benefactions of Mr. Cobbett. The Learned Counsel said he would not believe that Byrne would have spoken in praise of Parkins. He would as soon believe that snow and fire would unite and form one common element, or that the tiger and its prey would lie down in peace together! Parkins, although a verdict passed against him, refused to disburse the money which a Jury had decided he had obtained for Byrne, and the latter was obliged to wait the result of a second trial, which the former by means of affidavits, obtained. Thus was Byrne wearied by the law's delay, and distressed by its expense, but at length the money was wrested from the iron grasp of avarice. It was almost incredible to believe to what a degree of heartlessness did Parkins go. The Attorney General had been pleased to say, that had Mr. Cobbett meant to impute perjury to Mr. Hunt, a justification should have been put upon the record. It was further observed that at first a kind of justification was put on the record, but afterwards withdrawn. Mr. Cobbett did not mean nor did he ever impute perjury to Mr. Hunt. That gentleman would leave the Court with as fair a character as ever he had. All that Mr. Cobbett insisted upon was, that a garbled report of the trial appeared in the *Chronicle*, for the express purpose of injuring him. The Attorney General had addressed the Jury on the power of the Press. He (Mr. Phillips) was not standing there to do away with the impression thus created, neither should he appeal to

their passions in any panegyric upon the Press, but all that he should ask was, that if the construction of the passage in question were doubtful, in the name of that Press he would call upon them to put upon it that construction which it would bear with the rest of the article. He would ask of them not to judge of it harshly, but if they believed it of a libellous tendency let them condemn it; if they thought it free from accusation let them acquit. He would beg to remind them that no human tribunals were infallible, and that if they erred, the side of mercy was that on which he trusted they would err. If the meaning of the passage were obscure, then they would charitably lean toward the defendant. But he would ask, where was the proof of libel—and what damages could possibly be sought as compensation? Was Mr. Hunt's character injured? There might possibly be something like a passing cloud moving over it, but it was soon gone; and, like his jet blacking put upon boots, nothing could obscure for long the polished surface thus produced.—(A laugh.) Who is the plaintiff in this case? Who is the man now seeking for damages for an alleged loss of character? Who is this Henry Hunt that now complains of the abuses of the Press? He (Mr. Phillips) would suppose that he was reading, on a future day, of a great man then no more. He would endeavour to pay a tribute to his memory. This man, he would suppose, at one period of his life praised liberty, in the opinion of many, even to the borders of licentiousness, but, above all, he loved the freedom of the Press, and toasted it on every occasion, until Bacchus grew intoxicated, and Echo was herself hoarse with repeating the sounds. This individual, he would suppose, in one of those moments of hilarity, *Noctes cœnæque Deorum*, when the cup was sparkling to the brim, was suddenly surprised at the convivial board by the appearance of the Genius of Discord, and crying

aloud, "Pause, Henry Hunt! Look upon this picture. Your boots, which are now polished highly, have only just lost the mud of "Palace-yard."—(A laugh.) Here is this man of liquid blacking, who would now give all Spa-fields for the herb tobacco—who never roasted any thing in his life except corn—who advertises as selling the cheapest and best articles—and who would make the most of his character, as he does of his coffee and blacking.—(Continued laughter.) In the publication, there was not the slightest imputation cast upon Mr. Hunt's character, he would again declare, and the Jury would perceive, when they examined the document, that fact. Where was the constructive charge of perjury which Mr. Hunt made out? Nothing of the sort was, indeed, proved, and, as far as Mr. Cobbett was concerned, Mr. Hunt's character would stand as fair in the public estimation when the cause was decided as it did before the charge was brought. Mr. Cobbett never intended to impute perjury to him; all that he intended to convey to the public was, a complaint against the *Morning Chronicle* report, and in doing this he gave a reason why he entertained an opinion that the report was inaccurate. The Jury would not take money out of the pocket of Mr. Cobbett to put it into that of Mr. Hunt. It had been observed by the Attorney-General that Mr. Cobbett's son had gone over to Ireland for the purpose of having that affidavit, which had been read, sworn to by Byrne; and it was further insisted that either Mr. Cobbett or his son had drawn it up. Was any proof to this effect offered? Had it been true, how easy a thing it was to prove it. He would now leave the case in the hands of the Jury, they would have the publication in their possession when they retired from their box to consider on their verdict, which he trusted would exonerate his client, and, he believed, leave the character of Mr. Hunt in the same state, as to public opinion,



as heretofore. Mr. Hunt had brought this action, well knowing that if he obtained one farthing in damages, he would gain the costs of the suit. The publication he (the Learned Counsel, in conclusion) contended was perfectly innocent—that it contained no offensive expression towards Mr. Hunt—that the obvious meaning of it was not to cast an imputation on him—and that if the Jury entertained such opinions, they would give the defendant the benefit of them.

The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE charged the Jury at some length, recapitulating the different points of Swift's testimony as bearing upon the case, and calling the attention of the Jury to various passages in the alleged libel, which would render it susceptible of the construction put upon it by the plaintiff; or clear it from the mischievous tendency imputed to it, and acquit the author of any malicious design. There had been one point touched upon by the Learned Attorney General, which he, the Lord Chief Justice, would wish had not been introduced, since he had not attempted any proof of it. The Attorney-General had said, that the affidavit had been drawn by Mr. Cobbett or his son. Of this no proof was given; and his Lordship disapproved of such assertions, as they were followed by contradictions on the other side, and led to comments from the Judge, all of which occasioned a great consumption of the public time. The Jury would consider the character of the publication, which would be submitted to their inspection, and if it should appear susceptible of a libellous construction, they would assess such damages, as should appear to furnish a reasonable compensation for the injury sustained; and if, on the other hand, they should consider it free from such a character, they would acquit the defendant.

The Jury retired, and having consulted for a considerable time, finally returned a verdict in favour of the defendant.

Now, the first thing is, to do justice to my able and zealous COUNSEL, of whose exertions, on the occasion, the reader can, from the above report (though much fuller than, at a season like this, could have been expected), have but a very imperfect idea. The case was, indeed, *plain enough* to all those who well knew the parties, their characters and their motives, and especially to those who had heard the evidence of the "Unny Man" on the trial of BYRNE against PARKINS; but, to a jury, who might be strangers to all these, there required, especially after a statement from a man of such great ability as the Attorney General, a great deal of diligence and of ability in the DEFENDANT'S COUNSEL. I foresaw this, and, therefore, though, *in any case whatever*, I should have chosen Mr. PHILLIPS, whose clear and powerful manner of statement has always, since the first time I heard him, made me entertain the highest opinion, not only of his talents, but, which are of as great importance, his *diligence* and his *earnestness*; therefore, I chose him in this case, in preference to all others; and, seeing how much depended on him, I should act unjustly, if I withheld my acknowledgment, that I owe much to him on this occasion. There was the LORD CHIEF JUSTICE, to be sure, who knew all the circumstances too, and whose charge was perfectly impartial; but, without that clear and fine statement from my COUNSEL, it would have been next to impossible for the jury to have rightly and thoroughly understood all the merits of the case; that thorough understanding they had from my

counsel, and to that understanding I ascribe this honest verdict.

As to the affair itself, it is singular enough, that *I am never a plaintiff!* That I never fly to the law to protect my character! The Attorney General made a sort of complaint, that the law-suits, in which I was a party, *always made such a noise.* That is no fault of mine. I never bring any body into court. God knows I have had reason enough to do it, and might have done it, long ago, even with regard to the "Unny Man"; but I never have done it. So that, if I cause a noise in this way, it is, at any rate, only in self-defence.

I have, at various times, said a great deal about the institution of *Special Juries*; and the "Unny Man" *has done the same*, and in a strain much more violent. Let it be known, then, that it was *not I*, who put the "Unny Man" to the expense of a Special Jury on this occasion. He **CHOSE IT HIMSELF!** I was quite willing to be tried by *any twelve men in the country*, such as the old-fashioned law would have given us. He, refined mortal as he is, was more select in his taste. What his *motives and calculations* might be I know not; but, it is right that the public should know, that the Special Jury was the consequence of his application, and *not of mine.*

His selection of *His Majesty's Attorney General*, aided by two other able counsel, shows, also, that he is as "matchlessness" in his taste as he is in his ingredients for his blacking; and, if after all this selection and these pains, he has failed: if, instead of getting a *thousand pounds* (the alleged damages) out of my pocket (towards

whose election he said, the other day, he was disposed to give his "mite"), *he has to pay my costs in this case*; if this has befallen him, we must do him the justice to confess, that it has not befallen him for the want of diligence in the taking of precautions.

The Attorney General did himself honour by abstaining from that abuse of me, in which Scarlett, Denman and Adolphus have indulged; and, I am sure, that he must have been *pressingly instructed* to impute to me, or my son, the *drawing up of the affidavit of BYRNE.* My son was in some part of Ireland at the date of the affidavit; but, he *never saw BYRNE* while he was in Ireland.

As to the merits of the case, what a monstrous thing is it to call this *a libel!* Here comes the "Unny Man" and gives certain evidence; there is a *newspaper report* of this evidence, which is calculated to cause it to be believed, that I *unjustly withhold money* that I had collected for poor Byrne, or that Byrne is a *monster of ingratitude*; Byrne sees *this report*; he publishes an affidavit declaring the report to state a falsehood; I, in *justification of my own character*, republish that report; and, in justice to Byrne, I merely add, *my belief in the truth of that affidavit.* Neither of us say, that the report was correct; neither of us impute wilful perjury to the "Unny Man"; neither of us heard his evidence; neither of us say that the reported evidence was his evidence; neither of us admit the hypothesis of the evidence having been correctly given: and yet the "Unny Man" comes and sues for damage done to his character!



If the *newspaper reporter* had sued, there would have been some sense, at any rate, in his complaint.

I said, in my remarks upon Byrne's affidavit, as compared with the *reported evidence* of the "Unny Man," that there was a coincidence, as stated in "Unny's" reported evidence, which coincidence could not exist, except on the supposition that Byrne was mad at the time when he was said to have complained of me. The reported evidence said, that, *at the same time* that Byrne was complaining against me *for keeping his money from him*, HE SPOKE WELL OF PARKINS; and that, *I never had any of his money* (as the books would show), UNTIL AFTER BYRNE'S FIRST ACTION AGAINST PARKINS; so that, how could it be, that Byrne should complain of my keeping his money, and that he should, at the SAME TIME, *speak well of Parkins*? This was, to be sure, to show, that the *newspaper-reported evidence* MUST BE FALSE, unless Byrne were mad; but, neither I nor Byrne said, or insinuated, that that was the evidence given by the "Unny Man." I said, on the contrary, that *I did not hear the evidence*; and Byrne was in Ireland, and *could not hear it*. What did we do, therefore, but *deny the truth of a newspaper paragraph*, not at all imputing that paragraph to the "Unny Man"; and which paragraph was, too, most infamously slanderous on the character of one of us, setting me forth as the cheater of a poor man, or, setting Byrne forth as a perfect monster of ingratitude, or, as a madman.

The learned Attorney General is reported to have said, that the *libel*, as he was pleased to call it, "accuses Hunt of having disregarded the solemn obligation of an oath, and of having been guilty of the basest and most deliberate perjury." He is accused of nothing at all. The newspaper reporter is accused of falsehood; but Hunt is accused of nothing; and this the reader may see for himself. The learned counsel for the "Unny Man" seems to have been aware of this; for, a witness (one Mr. Swift) was brought to prove, that Hunt really did say, in his evidence, that BYRNE, at the same time that he complained of my keeping his money, spoke well of Parkins. [See Mr. SWIFT's evidence in the above report.] Ah! That is another thing. This is now sworn by Mr. Swift; but, neither Byrne nor I imputed any such evidence to Hunt; nor did we impute any evidence at all to him; and, if it be imputed to him now, it is not by me, nor by poor Byrne; but by his own witness, Mr. SWIFT! We did not hear the evidence; we never saw it published in any authentic form; we remarked on a newspaper paragraph; and, while we did this, I, for my part, complained of the garbled manner, in which the report of the evidence was given in this same newspaper.

What is Mr. SWIFT now brought for? Why, to prove (if the above report of his evidence be correct), that the newspaper report of the evidence was, as to the main point, correct. But, how was that to make against me? I had not heard the evidence; I said I had not heard it; I spoke of

the report only; I imputed blame to that report only; and used not a single word to cause it to be believed, that I looked upon the report as being correct. So that, be it what it might, no blame could possibly be imputed to me. Never, therefore, was there a more groundless action in this whole world: my steps were purely in defence of my own character; and this is so evident, that I really do wonder that the Attorney General should have even appeared to think otherwise.

I have, since this action was commenced, had several applications (not sanctioned, that I know of by the "Unny Man") to accommodate the matter, every one of which I have treated with silent contempt, or with a point blank refusal. I was certain, that I had done nothing that I ought not to do; and I was indignant at the thought of merely having it supposed that I had done wrong. I clearly enough saw what were the motives and calculations of the "Unny Man"; but, I relied firmly on the ability and zeal of my Counsel, on the impartiality of the Judge, and on the good sense and honesty of any twelve men that might be put into the box. I did not strike out one of the Special Jury; and I felt so confident, that a man never would be punished for defending his own character, that I did not even ask when the trial was coming on, and I learned the result, late at night, through a two-penny post note from my attorney. A fondness for law never marked my character; I never, in any case, criminal or civil, was a plaintiff, in the whole course of my now pretty long life; and, as to mere

personal reputation, if it stand in need of law to prop it up, I have always thought it hardly worth an effort to preserve it, and I have almost uniformly observed such efforts to be in vain.

Something was said about our not having justified, as it is called. That mode of proceeding would have compelled us to bring over poor BYRNE; and would, besides, have been to acknowledge that we had imputed the evidence to Hunt. Some steps were taken in this way; but, I was soon convinced, that this was the wrong course. I had published *no libel*; I had done nothing but what I had a clear right to do; and on that ground I resolved to stand before the Jury.

---

Resolutions of a Meeting, held at the Freemason's Tavern, and, by adjournment, in Lincoln's Inn Fields, on the 8th February, 1826; SIR THOMAS B. BEEVER, Bart. in the Chair.

Resolved, 1. That it is the opinion of this Meeting, that it would be beneficial to the country if Mr. Cobbett were a Member of the Commons' House of Parliament; and that it is, therefore, the opinion of this Meeting, that there ought to be raised by public subscription a sum of money sufficient for defraying any expenses that may become necessary for the accomplishment of that object.

2. That Sir Thomas Beever, Bart., be the Treasurer of such subscription.

3. That the subscriptions be paid to the Treasurer, or to a person authorized by him to receive subscriptions, at the Office of the Register, No. 188, Fleet-street, London.

4. That each subscriber shall, at the time of paying his subscription,



receive a receipt for the same, in the following form:—"Received of A. B. "the sum of as  
"a subscription towards defraying  
"any expenses that may arise from  
"any steps that may be taken for  
"the purpose of obtaining a return  
"of Mr. Cobbett to serve in parlia-  
"ment."

5. That, if it should so happen that there be not raised a sum sufficient to warrant an attempt to effect the object in view, then, in the space of ten days after the close of the next general election, each and every subscriber shall, upon presenting, or causing to be presented, his aforesaid receipt to the Treasurer, or other person appointed for the purpose, receive the whole amount of the sum stated in the said receipt, without any deduction whatsoever.

6. That if any attempt be made, and fail, or if it succeed; and if, in either case, there be a *surplus* remaining in the hands of the Treasurer, then the whole of such surplus shall, at the end of fifty days after the close of the next general election, be, in the manner above-mentioned, returned to the subscribers, in proportion to the sums that they may respectively have subscribed: and, in order that the subscribers may be duly apprized of the share of surplus due to each, the Committee (here below named) shall cause notice to be publicly given of the amount of such surplus, and of the time for repaying it to the subscribers, upon their producing their afore-mentioned receipts. But, in order that there may be a limit to the business of the Committee and the Treasurer, it is understood that, in this case, as well as in that mentioned in Resolution 5, if the subscriber do not make his demand within *three months*, or ninety-three days, after the times above specified, the Committee shall be at liberty to dispose of the unclaimed subscriptions in that way which they may deem most proper, consulting, in this respect, as far as may be practicable, the wishes of the subscribers

7. That each and every subscriber may subscribe in his own name, in any other name, or under any motto or designation that he may choose, and that his receipt, when produced (either by him or by any holder of it) shall be as valid as if given to him under his own name.

8. That Sir Thomas Beevor, Bart., Joseph Martin, Esq., of Lincoln's Inn, Peter Walker, Esq., of Worth, Sussex, William Withers, jun. Esq., of Holt, Norfolk, and William Palmer, Esq., of Bollitree, Herefordshire, be a Committee for deciding upon, and for carrying into execution all the measures necessary for effecting the several purposes above-mentioned, and that their order, or that of any three of them, shall be, to the Treasurer, his sufficient warrant for disposing of any sums of money, that he may receive on account of the said subscription.

The Committee hereby authorize the following gentlemen to collect subscriptions for the above purpose.

Mr. WILLIAM PALMER, (one of the Committee) Bollitree Castle, Herefordshire.

Mr. WILLIAM BUDD, clerk of the Peace, Newbury, Berks.

Mr. THOMAS SMITH, bookseller, Liverpool.

Mr. C. M. RILEY, Westgate, Wakefield, Yorkshire.

Mr. ROBERT ILES and Messrs. J. and S. VINES, Fairford Gloucestershire.

Mr. JOHN FORSTER, Knaresborough, Yorkshire.

Mr. W. P. SHIRLEY, Sutton-Valence, Kent.

Mr. WM. BIRCHINALL, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk.

Mr. FREDERICK JONES, Bristol.

Mr. BESLEY, News-Office, Exeter.

Mr. JOHN WOOD, Wettersham, Kent.

Mr. JOHN DRAKARD, News-Office,  
Stamford, Lincolnshire.

Mr. GEO. WRIGHT, bookseller,  
back of the Inns, Norwich.

Mr. JAMES BARLING, Fisherton,  
Salisbury.

Mr. WILLIAM FLOWER, Straw-  
hat Manufacturer, Eastbourne,  
Sussex.

Mr. C. W. HAYWARD, Queen-  
street, Sheffield, Yorkshire.

Mr. WROE, Bookseller, Man-  
chester.

Mr. MANN, Bookseller, Leeds.

Gentlemen in the country, who are willing to take upon themselves the trouble of collecting, are requested to send their names and addresses, to Sir T. Beavor, or to Mr. Cobbett, 183, Fleet Street; and they will be so good as to provide themselves with stamped receipts, agreeably to the Resolutions. The cost of these they can, of course, deduct from the subscriptions they may receive.

N. B. Notice will be given, in the next Register, of the day of holding the **FEAST OF THE GRIDIRON**. It will be sometime in April, I believe; and that, it is hoped, will suit the above gentlemen, and others who may add their names to the list, to come, and to join in this our **GRAND TRIUMPH**. — This day's post (Thursday's) brings me an account of *five Rooks*, who have just stopped! So that, as I said there would be, there is another "*late panic*." — And is it now, as I said it would be? The foolish and "best public instructor" said, that, when the storm was over, "the ship would be as right and as tight as ever." "Yes," said I, "right and tight,

"as a crazy old vessel that has had her masts and rigging and bulwarks and half her crew swept by the board; that has hoisted a *jury-mast* (a mast to *swear* by), with a sail tacked to it, made of sailors ragged shirts and of the female passengers' petticoats, just to give the dismal hulk a chance of being drifted to the land." — And is it not just so? Is not this the figure she now makes; and have not I been calumniated for twenty years for having put forth these, as they have been called, false prophecies? Prepare, then, my friends, for this **FEAST OF THE GRIDIRON**. Nobody ever was so moderate in expressions of triumph as we have been. We cannot help feeling for the misfortunes of our prejudiced and perverse neighbours; but, at any rate, we will have our feast.

#### PROTESTANT REFORMATION.

THE next and last Number of this work will not be published until the first of April. I have found it impossible to do that justice to it (which I am determined to do) amidst the deep interest excited by the subjects now in agitation. We are, as it were, living one minute in order to see what is to happen the next; and, while in such a state, it is impossible to think for many hours together about any thing else. I intended, and I expressed my intention of concluding the work, with a list of all the parcels of Protestant plunder in England and Ireland; but I find that this would occupy three or four numbers, and, therefore, I must con-



clude the work with a summary, instead of a detailed, account of these, though I may afterwards give that detail when I publish a more expensive edition of the work.

The second Number of **THE WOODLANDS** was very nearly ready for the press when the smashings in London and all over the country, when the howlings of the Jews, and the whinings of the Quakers, came and drove out of my head all thoughts about woodlands and all the poetical ideas about the blowing of the flowers and the singing of the birds. I hope that I shall shortly resume these Sylvan labours; much sooner, I hope, than Mr. Robinson will again be able to cause prosperity to be dispensed "from the ancient portals of a constitutional monarchy."

## FREE-TRADE PROJECT.

(Continued from p. 502.)

### ARTICLE XIII.

The Government of Colombia engages to co-operate with His Britannic Majesty for the total abolition of the slave-trade, and to prohibit all persons inhabiting within the territories of Columbia, in the most effectual manner, from taking any share in such trade.

### ARTICLE XIV.

And forasmuch as it would be convenient and useful, for the purpose of facilitating the mutual good understanding between the two contracting parties, and for avoiding all difficulties henceforward, that other articles should be proposed and added to the present treaty, which articles, both from a want of due time for their consideration, as well as from

the pressure of circumstances, cannot at present be drawn up with the required perfection, it has been and is agreed, on the part of both Powers, that they will, with the least possible delay, come forward to treat and agree upon such articles as may be wanting to this treaty, and deemed mutually beneficial; and which articles, when they shall be agreed upon, and shall be duly ratified, shall form part of the present treaty of amity, commerce, and navigation.

### ARTICLE XV.

The present treaty shall be ratified by His Majesty the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and by the President or Vice President charged with the executive power of the State of Colombia, with the consent and approbation of the Congress of the said State; and the ratifications shall be exchanged at London within the space of six months, or sooner if possible.

In witness whereof, the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed the same, and have affixed thereto the seals of their arms.

Done at the city of Bogota, the eighteenth day of April, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and twenty-five.

(L.S.) JOHN P. HAMILTON.  
(L.S.) PATRICK CAMPBELL.  
(L.S.) PEDRO GUAL.  
(L.S.) PEDRO B. MENDEZ.

### ADDITIONAL ARTICLE.

Whereas, in the present state of Colombian shipping, it would not be possible for Colombia to take advantage of the reciprocity established by the articles 5, 6, and 7, of the treaty signed this day, if that part should be carried into immediate effect which stipulates that in order to be considered as a Colombian ship, a ship shall actually have been built in Colombia, it is agreed that, for the

space of seven years, to be reckoned from the date of the ratification of this treaty, any ships, wheresoever built, being *bona fide* the property of any of the citizens of Colombia, and whereof the master and three-fourths of the mariners, at least, are also Colombian citizens, excepting where the laws provide for any extreme cases, shall be considered as Colombian ships:—His Majesty, the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, reserving to himself the right, at the end of the said term of seven years, to claim the principle of reciprocal restriction, stipulated for in the Article VII. above referred to, if the interests of British navigation shall be found to be prejudiced by the present exception to that reciprocity, in favour of Colombian shipping.

The present additional article shall have the same force and validity as if it were inserted, word for word, in the treaty signed this day. It shall be ratified, and the ratifications shall be exchanged at the same time.

In witness whereof the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed the same, and have affixed thereto the seals of their arms.

Done in the city of Bogota, the 18th day of April, in the year of our Lord 1825.

(L.S.) JOHN P. HAMILTON.  
(L.S.) PATRICK CAMPBELL.  
(L.S.) PEDRO GUAL.  
(L.S.) PEDRO B. MENDEZ.

*Declaration by His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, on the exchange of Ratifications.*

The undersigned, His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, at the moment of exchanging with Senor Manuel Jose Hurtado, Plenipotentiary of the State of Colombia, the ratifications of the treaty of amity, commerce, and navigation, signed at Bogota, on the 18th of April, 1825, by John Potter

Hamilton, Esq., and Patrick Campbell, Esq., on the part of His Majesty, and Senor Pedro Gual, and General Pedro Briceno Mendez, on the part of the State of Colombia, has been commanded by His Majesty, in order to avoid any misunderstanding which might possibly arise in the execution of that part of the seventh article of the said treaty, wherein it is defined what ships shall be considered as entitled to the privileges of British and Colombian ships, to declare to Senor Hurtado, that, in addition to the qualifications therein expressed, such other ships will likewise be entitled to be considered as British ships, which shall have been captured from an enemy by His Majesty's ships of war, or by subjects of His Majesty furnished with letters of marque by the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, and regularly condemned in one of His Majesty's Prize Courts as a lawful prize, or which shall have been condemned in any competent court, for the breach of the laws made for the prevention of the slave trade; and that, in the same manner, ships captured from the enemy by the ships of Colombia, and condemned under similar circumstances, will likewise be entitled to be considered as Colombian ships.

GEORGE CANNING.

London, Nov. 7, 1826.

Senor Manuel Jose Hurtado, &c. &c.

*Act of Acceptance of the above Declaration, by the Colombian Plenipotentiary.*

The undersigned, Plenipotentiary of the State of Colombia, having received from His Britannic Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, a declaration, stating, "That in order to avoid any misunderstanding which might possibly arise in the execution of that part of the seventh article of the treaty between His Britannic Majesty and the State of Colombia, signed at Bogota, on the 18th of April, 1825, wherein



is defined what ships shall be considered as entitled to the privileges of British and Colombian ships, in addition to the qualifications therein expressed, such other ships will likewise be entitled to be considered as British ships, which shall have been captured from an enemy by His Britannic Majesty's ships of war, or by subjects of his said Majesty furnished with letters of marque by the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, and regularly condemned in one of his said Majesty's Prize Courts as a lawful prize, or which shall have been condemned in any competent court, for the breach of the laws made for the prevention of the slave trade: and that, in the same manner, ships captured from the enemy by the ships of Colombia, and condemned under similar circumstances, will likewise be entitled to be considered as Colombian ships."

The undersigned, in virtue of the full powers with which he is invested, hereby accepts and adopts the said declaration, in the name and on the behalf of his Government.

MANUEL JOSE HURTADO.

London, Nov. 7, 1825.

The Right Hon. George Canning  
&c. &c. &c.

#### CONVENTION OF COMMERCE

*Between His Majesty and the Free Hanseatic Republics of Lubeck, Bremen, and Hamburgh. Signed at London, Sept. 29, 1825.*

His Majesty the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, on the one part, and the Senate of the Free Hanseatic City of Lubeck, the Senate of the Free Hanseatic City of Bremen, and the Senate of the Free Hanseatic City of Hamburgh (each State for itself separately) on the other part, being equally desirous of affording every facility and encouragement to their subjects and citizens engaged in

commercial intercourse with each other, and being of opinion that nothing will more contribute to the attainment of this desirable object than a reciprocal abrogation of all discriminating and countervailing duties levied upon the ships of the high contracting parties, or upon the cargoes of such ships, in the ports of either, have appointed their Plenipotentiaries to conclude a convention for that purpose, that is to say:—

His Majesty the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, the Right Honourable George Canning, a Member of His Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, a Member of Parliament, and His said Majesty's principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs; and the Right Honourable William Huskisson, a Member of His said Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, a Member of Parliament, President of the Committee of Privy Council for Affairs of Trade and Foreign Plantations, and Treasurer of His said Majesty's Navy:—

And the Senate of the Free Hanseatic City of Lubeck, the Senate of the Free Hanseatic City of Bremen, and the Senate of the Free Hanseatic City of Hamburgh, James Colquhoun, Esq., their Agent and Consul-General in Great Britain:—

Who, after having communicated to each other their respective full powers, found to be in due and proper form, have agreed upon and concluded the following articles;—

#### ARTICLE I.

From and after the date hereof, British vessels entering or departing from the ports of the Free Hanseatic Republics of Lubeck, Bremen, or Hamburgh, and Lubeck, Bremen, or Hamburgh vessels entering or departing from the ports of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, shall not be subject to any other or higher ship duties or charges than are or shall be levied on national vessels entering or departing from such ports respectively.

(To be continued.)

## MARKETS.

Average Prices of CORN throughout ENGLAND, for the week ending February 11.

Per Quarter.			
s.	d.	s.	d.
Wheat ..	60 0	Oats ....	23 11
Rye .....	41 3	Beans ...	39 10
Barley ..	56 7	Pease ...	43 4

Total Quantity of Corn returned as Sold in the Maritime Districts, for the Week ended February 11.

Qrs.		Qrs.	
Wheat ..	37,174	Oats ...	32,504
Rye .....	263	Beans ...	4,603
Barley ..	37,328	Pease ...	1,598

Aggregate Average of the six weeks preceding Feb. 15, by which importation is regulated.

Per Quarter.			
s.	d.	s.	d.
Wheat .....	60	5	
Rye .....	42	8	
Barley .....	37	1	
Oats .....	24	7	
Beans .....	40	1	
Pease .....	44	3	

Corn Exchange, Mark Lane.

Quantities and Prices of British Corn, &c. sold and delivered in this Market, during the week ended Saturday, February 11.

Qrs.	£.	s.	d.	s.	d.
Wheat..	5,540	for 17,193	14 7	Average, 61	8
Barley..	4,694	.. 8,676	9 2	.....	36 11
Oats..	7,772	.. 10,611	2 5	.....	27 4
Rye ....	19	.... 34	10 6	.....	36 4
Beans..	1,842	.... 3,772	9 7	.....	40 11
Pease ..	637	.... 1,376	3 10	.....	43 2

Friday, Feb. 17.—The arrivals of Grain this week are tolerably good, with another large supply of Flour. The Wheat trade continues in a very languid state, and the prices are still looking downward. Barley, Beans, and Pease, remain very dull also. Oats are difficult of sale, and may

be reported rather lower than Monday.

Monday, Feb. 20.—The supplies of Grain last week were tolerably good, and there was again a large quantity of Flour. From Essex, Kent, and Suffolk, there was only a small supply of Wheat, Barley, Beans, and Pease, to this morning's market; and the wind being boisterous, there are not many vessels fresh in since Friday from more distant ports. There is very little Wheat of superfine quality for sale, and such has obtained a slight advance on the terms of this day se'n-night, but the price of other sorts is governed more by buyers than sellers.

Barley is nearly unsaleable, and is further reduced 1s. per quarter. Beans are 1s. to 2s. per quarter lower than last quoted. Oats of good quality meet a sale at the terms of this day se'n-night; but other sorts are rather cheaper. The top price of Flour remains as last quoted, but the trade is dull in this article.

SMITHFIELD, Monday, Feb. 20.

Per Stone of 8 pounds (alive).

s.	d.	s.	d.
Beef .....	3 8	to 4 10	
Mutton ...	3 10	— 4 10	
Veal .....	5 6	— 6 4	
Pork .....	5 2	— 6 4	
Beasts ...	2,885	Sheep ..	19,680
Calves ...	93	Pigs ...	120

NEWGATE, (same day.)

Per Stone of 8 pounds (dead).

s.	d.	s.	d.
Beef .....	3 4	to 4 4	
Mutton ...	3 8	— 4 4	
Veal ....	4 0	— 6 0	
Pork .....	3 8	— 5 8	